

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 22 and 23 and allowed claims 15-18, 20 and 21. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,837) in view of Bradshaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,295). Applicant respectfully believes that the rejections can be withdrawn for the reasons set forth below.

Hilton et al. estimate a “requested print consumable amount” of a print job based on an assumption that each print of the print job will utilize an average amount of print consumable or the amount used to print an average sheet [column 8, lines 48-61]. As a result, Hilton et al. determine whether a print job can be completed based on a comparison of a number of prints to be made, as entered by the customer, and the chip number that represents a number of average prints that the cartridge can accommodate [column 10, line 47 – column 11, line 3]. Thus, Hilton et al. do not pay any consideration to the image of the print job that is to be printed or rendered using the cartridge.

As a result, Hilton et al. fail to disclose “estimating a requested print consumable amount based on the image file and the copy number that is needed to render the print job before rendering the print job”, as described in claim 1. Additionally, Hilton et al. fail to disclose a print consumables monitoring module that is configured to “estimate a requested print consumable amount based on the image file and the copy number that is needed to process the print job before rendering of the print job begins”, as described in claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 22 are not rendered obvious by the cited references since they fail to disclose all of the claimed features, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11-13 and 23 are allowable as being dependent from one of allowable base claims 1 and 22, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hilton et al. and Bradshaw et al., as applied to claim 23 and further in view of Maruata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,838). Applicant submits that claims 4 and 10 are allowable as being dependent from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of claims 4 and 10 be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb